

Subgroup Achievement and Gap Trends — Minnesota

K-12 enrollment — 823,234

The raw data used to develop these state profiles, including data for additional grade levels and years before 2002, can be found on the CEP Web site at www.cep-dc.org. Click on the link on the left labeled State Testing Data. In the list of results that appears, look for the most recent report on student achievement since 2002. Below the name of the report, click on the link for State Profiles and Worksheets. Scroll down the page until you reach the list of states. Click on the Worksheet link for proficiency data or scale score data for a particular state.

Subgroup Achievement Trends and Gap Trends — Key Findings

Summary. In grade 8 (the only grade in which subgroup trends were analyzed by achievement level), Minnesota showed mostly gains in reading at the basic, proficient, and advanced levels for racial/ethnic subgroups, low income students, and boys and girls. In math, there were gains across the board – all subgroups at all three achievement levels. Achievement gaps widened in reading, and there was a mixed picture in math. Comparable data were available from 2006 to 2009.

- **Exceptions.** The Latino subgroup had declines at all the achievement levels in 8th grade in reading. There were declines for the Asian subgroup at the basic and proficient levels in reading, as well as for low-income students at the basic level.
- **Widening achievement gaps in reading.** Almost all gaps between students in racial/ethnic and income subgroups and their white and non-low income peers widened in reading. The exceptions were Native Americans at the high school level, and boys narrowed the gap with girls at the middle and high school levels.
- **Mixed gap trends in math.** Achievement gaps in math tended to widen in high school, but there was a mixed picture in the lower grades according to the percentage proficient and mean (average) score indicators.

Data Limitations

Years of comparable percentage proficient data	2006 through 2009
Years of comparable mean scale score data	2006 through 2009
Disaggregated data for all subgroups and comparison groups	Proficiency and effect size data are available for most subgroups and comparison groups for 2006 through 2009. Because of changes to English language learner (ELL) MCA-II participation in 2007 (see details in the Major Changes section below), MN recommends against making comparisons for this subgroup from 2006 to 2007. As a result, ELL and non-ELL comparisons were conducted using 2007 as the base year.

Test Characteristics

The characteristics highlighted below are for the state reading and mathematics tests used for accountability under the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB).

Test(s) used for NCLB accountability	Minnesota Comprehensive Assessments-Series II (MCA-II) Mathematics Test for English Language Learners (MTELL), a reduced language, accommodated form of the MCA-II math test Minnesota Test of Academic Skills (MTAS), a revised alternate assessment for the “1%” population of students with disabilities
Grades tested for NCLB accountability	3–8 and 10 (reading), 11 (math)
State labels for achievement levels	MN uses four achievement levels: Does Not Meet the Standards, Partially Meets the Standards, Meets the Standards, and Exceeds the Standards. For our analyses we treated Partially Meets the Standards as Basic, Meets the Standards as Proficient, and Exceeds the Standards as Advanced.
High school NCLB test also used as an exit exam?	Yes, the MCA-II is one option to fulfill one’s graduation assessment requirement. There is also a separate graduation exam (The Graduation-Required Assessment for Diploma, or GRAD).
First year test used	2006 (New test standards were set based on new content standards, so comparisons with previous years’ results are not appropriate)
Time of test administration	Spring
Major changes in testing system (2002–present)	2006: Assessments and adequate yearly progress calculations

expanded to include all students in grades 3–8, 10, and 11

2006: Spring test administration became baseline for equating results from reading and math MCA-II tests for all grades; new standard setting conducted in summer 2006

2007: The following major changes were made affecting participation of English language learners (ELLs) in the MCA-II assessments; these changes suggest caution should be used in interpreting MCA-II trends between 2006 and 2007:

(a) In 2007, all ELLs were given the MCA-II reading test for NCLB purposes; previously, in 2006, many ELLs substituted scores on the Title III reading assessment (Test of Emerging Academic English) for NCLB purposes.

(b) In 2007, many ELLs took the MTELL in place of the MCA-II math test; their scores and proficiency data are not included in the 2007 MCA-II math results. The MTELL is intended as an accommodated, reduced language form of the MCA-II. It has been approved for use in AYP by USED.

2007–08: Science tests administered at grades 5, 8, and high school

Achievement by Subgroup — Trends at the Middle School Level

Note: The tables in this profile of subgroup achievement and gap trends begin with table 7. Tables 1 through 6 can be found in the companion state profile of general achievement trends.

Table MN-7. Percentages of grade 8 students by racial or ethnic subgroup scoring at the advanced, proficient-and-above, and basic-and-above levels in reading

Subgroup	Reporting year								Average yearly percentage point gain ¹
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	
All tested students									
Advanced					33%	36%	35%	36%	1.1
Proficient-and-above					65%	63%	66%	67%	0.7
Basic-and-above					86%	84%	85%	86%	0.1
White									
Advanced					36%	41%	40%	41%	1.7
Proficient-and-above					69%	69%	72%	74%	1.5
Basic-and-above					89%	88%	90%	90%	0.6
African American									
Advanced					12%	14%	13%	14%	0.8
Proficient-and-above					36%	35%	36%	38%	0.6
Basic-and-above					65%	62%	62%	65%	0.1
Latino									
Advanced					16%	15%	15%	15%	-0.6
Proficient-and-above					44%	37%	41%	41%	-0.9
Basic-and-above					72%	65%	67%	68%	-1.3
Asian									
Advanced					27%	29%	27%	28%	0.4
Proficient-and-above					58%	54%	54%	55%	-1.2
Basic-and-above					85%	80%	78%	78%	-2.2
Native American									
Advanced					14%	15%	15%	16%	0.5
Proficient-and-above					40%	36%	42%	43%	1.0
Basic-and-above					69%	63%	69%	73%	1.4

Table reads: The percentage of white 8th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state reading test increased from 36% in 2006 to 41% in 2009. During this period, the average yearly gain in the percentage advanced in reading for white 8th graders was 1.7 percentage points per year.

¹Averages are subject to rounding error.

²The number of students tested in this subgroup at this grade level was fewer than 500 in 2009 or the most recent year with available data, so changes for this subgroup should be interpreted with caution.

Table MN-8. Percentage of grade 8 students by demographic subgroup scoring at the advanced, proficient-and-above, and basic-and-above levels in reading

Subgroup	Reporting year								Average yearly percentage point gain ¹
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	
All tested students									
Advanced					33%	36%	35%	36%	1.1
Proficient-and-above					65%	63%	66%	67%	0.7
Basic-and-above					86%	84%	85%	86%	0.1
Low-income students									
Advanced					16%	18%	17%	17%	0.4
Proficient-and-above					45%	42%	44%	45%	0.2
Basic-and-above					73%	69%	71%	72%	-0.3
Students with disabilities ³									
Advanced					7%	8%	7%	7%	0.3
Proficient-and-above					23%	22%	24%	24%	0.4
Basic-and-above					47%	46%	49%	49%	0.7
English language learners ³									
Advanced						7%	5%	4%	-1.8
Proficient-and-above						26%	21%	22%	-2.2
Basic-and-above						56%	51%	52%	-1.9
Female									
Advanced					37%	41%	41%	42%	1.4
Proficient-and-above					70%	68%	71%	72%	0.7
Basic-and-above					89%	87%	89%	89%	0.1
Male									
Advanced					28%	32%	29%	30%	0.8
Proficient-and-above					60%	59%	60%	62%	0.8
Basic-and-above					82%	81%	82%	82%	0.1

Table reads: The percentage of low-income 8th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state reading test increased from 16% in 2006 to 17% in 2009. During this period, the average yearly gain in the percentage advanced in reading for low-income 8th graders was 0.4 percentage points per year.

¹Averages are subject to rounding error.

²The number of students tested in this subgroup at this grade level was fewer than 500 in 2009 or the most recent year with available data, so changes for this subgroup should be interpreted with caution.

³Gap trends for students with disabilities and English language learners should be interpreted with caution because state and federal policy changes may have affected the year-to-year comparability of test results for these subgroups. Average yearly percentage point gains are based on 2006-2009 results for students with disabilities and 2007-2009 results for English language learners.

Table MN-9. Percentages of grade 8 students by racial or ethnic subgroup scoring at the advanced, proficient-and-above, and basic-and-above levels in mathematics

Subgroup	Reporting year								Average yearly percentage point gain ¹
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	
All tested students									
Advanced					19%	19%	22%	21%	0.4
Proficient-and-above					57%	57%	57%	58%	0.5
Basic-and-above					80%	78%	77%	81%	0.3
White									
Advanced					22%	21%	25%	24%	0.5
Proficient-and-above					63%	63%	63%	65%	0.8
Basic-and-above					85%	84%	83%	86%	0.3
African American									
Advanced					4%	4%	5%	4%	0.2
Proficient-and-above					22%	23%	23%	24%	0.5
Basic-and-above					48%	46%	45%	50%	0.9
Latino									
Advanced					6%	5%	7%	6%	0.2
Proficient-and-above					28%	27%	28%	30%	0.5
Basic-and-above					56%	55%	52%	59%	1.3
Asian									
Advanced					17%	18%	20%	21%	1.1
Proficient-and-above					52%	55%	52%	55%	1.0
Basic-and-above					79%	81%	74%	80%	0.2
Native American									
Advanced					5%	4%	5%	5%	0.0
Proficient-and-above					27%	26%	28%	31%	1.3
Basic-and-above					54%	48%	50%	58%	1.1

Table reads: The percentage of white 8th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state math test increased from 22% in 2006 to 24% in 2009. During this period, the average yearly gain in the percentage advanced in math for white 8th graders was 0.5 percentage points per year.

¹Averages are subject to rounding error.

²The number of students tested in this subgroup at this grade level was fewer than 500 in 2009 or the most recent year with available data, so changes for this subgroup should be interpreted with caution.

Table MN-10. Percentage of grade 8 students by demographic subgroup scoring at the advanced, proficient-and-above, and basic-and-above levels in mathematics

	Reporting year								Average yearly percentage point gain ¹
Subgroup	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	
All tested students									
Advanced					19%	19%	22%	21%	0.4
Proficient-and-above					57%	57%	57%	58%	0.5
Basic-and-above					80%	78%	77%	81%	0.3
Low-income students									
Advanced					7%	7%	8%	8%	0.3
Proficient-and-above					34%	34%	34%	36%	0.6
Basic-and-above					61%	60%	58%	64%	0.7
Students with disabilities ³									
Advanced					3%	3%	4%	4%	0.3
Proficient-and-above					16%	17%	18%	19%	0.8
Basic-and-above					37%	36%	36%	40%	0.9
English language learners ³									
Advanced						3%	3%	3%	-0.3
Proficient-and-above						24%	17%	20%	-1.7
Basic-and-above						52%	42%	51%	-0.3
Female									
Advanced					20%	19%	21%	20%	0.1
Proficient-and-above					58%	58%	57%	59%	0.2
Basic-and-above					81%	80%	78%	82%	0.1
Male									
Advanced					19%	18%	22%	21%	0.7
Proficient-and-above					56%	55%	57%	58%	0.8
Basic-and-above					78%	77%	76%	80%	0.5

Table reads: The percentage of low-income 8th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state math test increased from 7% in 2006 to 8% in 2009. During this period, the average yearly gain in the percentage advanced in math for low-income 8th graders was 0.3 percentage points per year.

¹Averages are subject to rounding error.

²The number of students tested in this subgroup at this grade level was fewer than 500 in 2009 or the most recent year with available data, so changes for this subgroup should be interpreted with caution.

³Gap trends for students with disabilities and English language learners should be interpreted with caution because state and federal policy changes may have affected the year-to-year comparability of test results for these subgroups. Average yearly percentage point gains are based on 2006-2009 results for students with disabilities and 2007-2009 results for English language learners.

Achievement by Subgroup — Gap Trends (Percentages Proficient)

Table MN-11. Subgroup achievement trends in reading by percentages proficient

NOTE: L = larger gain than comparison group. S = smaller gain than comparison group. E = equal gain to comparison group.

If the average annual gain for the subgroup of interest, such as African American students, is larger than the average annual gain for the comparison group, such as white students, this indicates that the achievement gap has narrowed. If the average gain for the subgroup of interest is smaller, this means the gap has widened.

Subgroup	Grade 4					Grade 8					Grade 10				
	Year span	Starting PP	Ending PP	Average annual gain ¹	Gain larger or smaller than comparison group	Year span	Starting PP	Ending PP	Average annual gain ¹	Gain larger or smaller than comparison group	Year span	Starting PP	Ending PP	Average annual gain ¹	Gain larger or smaller than comparison group
All tested students	06-09	77%	75%	-0.7		06-09	65%	67%	0.7		06-09	65%	74%	3.0	
White	06-09	81%	82%	0.2		06-09	69%	74%	1.5		06-09	70%	81%	3.7	
African American	06-09	50%	49%	-0.3	S	06-09	36%	38%	0.6	S	06-09	33%	42%	3.2	S
Latino	06-09	58%	49%	-3.1	S	06-09	44%	41%	-0.9	S	06-09	41%	47%	2.0	S
Asian	06-09	67%	63%	-1.5	S	06-09	58%	55%	-1.2	S	06-09	54%	59%	1.6	S
Native American	06-09	56%	54%	-0.7	S	06-09	40%	43%	1.0	S	06-09	38%	50%	3.9	L
Not low-income	06-09	84%	84%	-0.1		06-09	73%	77%	1.2		06-09	73%	83%	3.3	
Low-income	06-09	59%	56%	-1.1	S	06-09	45%	45%	0.2	S	06-09	42%	52%	3.3	E
Not disabled	06-09	82%	80%	-0.7		06-09	70%	73%	0.8		06-09	71%	80%	2.9	
Students with disabilities ³	06-09	48%	44%	-1.4	S	06-09	23%	24%	0.4	S	06-09	20%	32%	4.0	L
Not ELLs	07-09	76%	78%	1.4		07-09	66%	70%	1.9		07-09	65%	77%	6.3	
English language learners ³	07-09	31%	38%	3.3	L	07-09	26%	22%	-2.2	S	07-09	19%	27%	4.3	S
Female	06-09	79%	77%	-0.6		06-09	70%	72%	0.7		06-09	71%	76%	1.6	
Male	06-09	75%	72%	-0.9	S	06-09	60%	62%	0.8	L	06-09	60%	73%	4.3	L

Table reads: In 2006, 81% of white 4th graders and 50% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level on the state reading test. In 2009, 82% of white 4th graders and 49% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level in reading. Between 2006 and 2009, the percentage proficient improved at an average rate of 0.2 percentage points per year for white students and declined at an average rate of 0.3 percentage points per year for African American students, indicating a smaller rate of gain and a widening of the achievement gap for African American 4th graders.

¹Numbers in these columns are subject to rounding error.

²The number of students tested in this subgroup at this grade level was fewer than 500 in 2009 or the most recent year with available data, so changes for this subgroup should be interpreted with caution.

³Gap trends for students with disabilities and English language learners should be interpreted with caution because state and federal policy changes may have affected the year-to-year comparability of test results for these subgroups.

Table MN-12. Subgroup achievement trends in mathematics by percentages proficient

NOTE: L = larger gain than comparison group. S = smaller gain than comparison group. E = equal gain to comparison group.

If the average annual gain for the subgroup of interest, such as African American students, is larger than the average annual gain for the comparison group, such as white students, this indicates that the achievement gap has narrowed. If the average gain for the subgroup of interest is smaller, this means the gap has widened.

Subgroup	Grade 4					Grade 8					Grade 11				
	Year span	Starting PP	Ending PP	Average annual gain ¹	Gain larger or smaller than comparison group	Year span	Starting PP	Ending PP	Average annual gain ¹	Gain larger or smaller than comparison group	Year span	Starting PP	Ending PP	Average annual gain ¹	Gain larger or smaller than comparison group
All tested students	06-09	69%	73%	1.2		06-09	57%	58%	0.5		06-09	30%	41%	3.7	
White	06-09	76%	80%	1.3		06-09	63%	65%	0.8		06-09	33%	47%	4.4	
African American	06-09	38%	44%	2.0	L	06-09	22%	24%	0.5	S	06-09	5%	10%	1.9	S
Latino	06-09	43%	47%	1.6	L	06-09	28%	30%	0.5	S	06-09	10%	16%	1.8	S
Asian	06-09	59%	66%	2.5	L	06-09	52%	55%	1.0	L	06-09	24%	35%	3.6	S
Native American	06-09	49%	53%	1.6	L	06-09	27%	31%	1.3	L	06-09	10%	18%	2.8	S
Not low-income	06-09	79%	83%	1.2		06-09	67%	69%	0.5		06-09	36%	49%	4.4	
Low-income	06-09	49%	54%	1.5	L	06-09	34%	36%	0.6	L	06-09	12%	20%	2.6	S
Not disabled	06-09	73%	77%	1.3		06-09	62%	64%	0.6		06-09	33%	45%	4.1	
Students with disabilities ³	06-09	43%	45%	0.4	S	06-09	16%	19%	0.8	L	06-09	4%	7%	1.0	S
Not ELLS	07-09	71%	76%	2.3		07-09	59%	61%	0.8		07-09	33%	43%	5.1	
English language learners ³	07-09	36%	41%	2.7	L	07-09	24%	20%	-1.7	S	07-09	4%	10%	3.3	S
Female	06-09	69%	73%	1.3		06-09	58%	59%	0.2		06-09	28%	39%	3.7	
Male	06-09	69%	72%	1.0	S	06-09	56%	58%	0.8	L	06-09	32%	43%	3.8	L

Table reads: In 2006, 76% of white 4th graders and 38% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level on the state math test. In 2009, 80% of white 4th graders and 44% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level in math. Between 2006 and 2009, the percentage proficient improved at an average rate of 1.3 percentage points per year for white students and 2.0 percentage points per year for African American students, indicating a larger rate of gain and a narrowing of the achievement gap for African American 4th graders.

¹Numbers in these columns are subject to rounding error.

²The number of students tested in this subgroup at this grade level was fewer than 500 in 2009 or the most recent year with available data, so changes for this subgroup should be interpreted with caution.

³Gap trends for students with disabilities and English language learners should be interpreted with caution because state and federal policy changes may have affected the year-to-year comparability of test results for these subgroups.

Achievement by Subgroup — Gap Trends (Mean Scale Scores)

Table MN-13. Achievement gap trends in reading by mean scale scores

NOTE: L = larger gain than comparison group. S = smaller gain than comparison group. E = equal gain to comparison group. MSS = mean scale score. SD = standard deviation. If the average gain for the subgroup of interest, such as African American students, is larger than the average gain for the comparison group, such as white students, this indicates that the achievement gap has narrowed. If the average gain for the subgroup of interest is smaller, this means the gap has widened.

Subgroup	Statistic	Grade 4					Grade 8					Grade 10				
		Year span	Start year	End year	Avg. gain MSS ¹	Gain larger or smaller than comp. group	Year span	Start year	End year	Avg. gain MSS ¹	Gain larger or smaller than comp. group	Year span	Start year	End year	Avg. gain MSS ¹	Gain larger or smaller than comp. group
All tested students	MSS	06-09	459.6	457.7	-0.6		06-09	853.3	854.2	0.3		06-09	1053.8	1056.7	1.0	
	SD	06-09	16.0	15.7			06-09	13.7	14.4			06-09	14.7	13.4		
White	MSS	06-09	461.5	460.6	-0.3		06-09	854.7	856.4	0.6		06-09	1055.4	1059.1	1.2	
	SD	06-09	15.2	14.3			06-09	13.1	13.5			06-09	14.1	12.1		
African American	MSS	06-09	448.2	447.2	-0.4	S	06-09	843.7	844.4	0.2	S	06-09	1042.0	1045.6	1.2	E
	SD	06-09	16.3	16.0			06-09	14.0	14.5			06-09	15.3	14.3		
Latino	MSS	06-09	451.8	447.8	-1.3	S	06-09	846.3	845.6	-0.2	S	06-09	1045.7	1047.9	0.7	S
	SD	06-09	15.5	15.7			06-09	14.3	14.1			06-09	14.8	13.7		
Asian	MSS	06-09	456.5	453.8	-0.9	S	06-09	852.0	851.2	-0.3	S	06-09	1051.1	1051.9	0.3	S
	SD	06-09	16.7	16.8			06-09	13.0	15.8			06-09	14.6	14.0		
Native American	MSS	06-09	451.2	449.5	-0.6	S	06-09	845.3	846.6	0.4	S	06-09	1045.0	1048.7	1.2	E
	SD	06-09	15.4	14.8			06-09	14.0	13.7			06-09	14.1	13.0		
Not low-income	MSS	06-09	462.9	461.8	-0.4		06-09	856.0	857.6	0.5		06-09	1056.5	1059.8	1.1	
	SD	06-09	14.8	14.1			06-09	12.7	13.3			06-09	13.7	12.0		
Low-income	MSS	06-09	452.3	450.1	-0.7	S	06-09	846.6	846.8	0.1	S	06-09	1045.8	1049.1	1.1	E
	SD	06-09	16.0	15.6			06-09	13.7	14.0			06-09	14.8	13.5		
Not disabled	MSS	06-09	461.6	459.8	-0.6		06-09	855.3	856.3	0.3		06-09	1055.9	1058.5	0.9	
	SD	06-09	14.6	14.2			06-09	12.2	13.2			06-09	13.4	12.3		
Students with disabilities ³	MSS	06-09	448.1	445.4	-0.9	S	06-09	838.3	839.3	0.3	E	06-09	1037.1	1042.9	2.0	L
	SD	06-09	18.4	18.2			06-09	14.5	14.0			06-09	14.5	13.2		
Not ELLs	MSS	07-09	458.4	459.1	0.4		07-09	854.3	855.2	0.4		07-09	1053.6	1057.7	2.1	
	SD	07-09	15.2	15.1			07-09	14.2	14.0			07-09	14.8	12.7		
English language learners ³	MSS	07-09	441.9	443.8	1.0	L	07-09	840.5	839.3	-0.6	S	07-09	1036.8	1040.9	2.0	S
	SD	07-09	14.6	14.5			07-09	13.5	12.5			07-09	14.2	13.2		
Female	MSS	06-09	460.7	459.1	-0.5		06-09	855.2	856.5	0.4		06-09	1056.1	1057.6	0.5	
	SD	06-09	15.6	15.4			06-09	13.2	14.3			06-09	14.1	13.2		
Male	MSS	06-09	458.6	456.4	-0.7	S	06-09	851.4	852.1	0.2	S	06-09	1051.6	1055.9	1.4	L
	SD	06-09	16.2	15.8			06-09	14.0	14.3			06-09	14.9	13.5		

Table reads: In 2006, the mean scale score on the state 4th grade reading test was 461.5 for white students and 448.2 for African American students. In 2009, the mean scale score in 4th grade reading was 460.6 for white students and 447.2 for African American students. Between 2006 and 2009, the mean scale score declined at an average yearly rate of 0.3 points for white students and 0.4 points for African American students, indicating a widening of the achievement gap for African Americans.

Note: The Minnesota Comprehensive Assessments—Series II (MCA-II) is scored on a scale of x01 – x99; x indicates the grade level.

¹Numbers in these columns are subject to rounding error.

²The number of students tested in this subgroup at this grade level was fewer than 500 in 2009 or the most recent year with available data, so changes for this subgroup should be interpreted with caution.

³Gap trends for students with disabilities and English language learners should be interpreted with caution because state and federal policy changes may have affected the year-to-year comparability of test results for these subgroups.

Table MN-14. Achievement gap trends in mathematics by mean scale scores

NOTE: L = larger gain than comparison group. S = smaller gain than comparison group. E = equal gain to comparison group. MSS = mean scale score. SD = standard deviation. If the average gain for the subgroup of interest, such as African American students, is larger than the average gain for the comparison group, such as white students, this indicates that the achievement gap has narrowed. If the average gain for the subgroup of interest is smaller, this means the gap has widened.

Subgroup	Statistic	Grade 4					Grade 8					Grade 11				
		Year span	Start year	End year	Avg. gain MSS ¹	Gain larger or smaller than comp. group	Year span	Start year	End year	Avg. gain MSS ¹	Gain larger or smaller than comp. group	Year span	Start year	End year	Avg. gain MSS ¹	Gain larger or smaller than comp. group
All tested students	MSS	06-09	455.0	456.7	0.6		06-09	850.8	851.5	0.2		06-09	1138.9	1144.2	1.8	
	SD	06-09	13.4	13.6			06-09	15.0	15.1			06-09	19.6	20.4		
White	MSS	06-09	457.2	459.1	0.6		06-09	853.0	854.0	0.3		06-09	1141.3	1147.5	2.1	
	SD	06-09	12.4	12.4			06-09	13.9	14.0			06-09	18.8	18.9		
African American	MSS	06-09	444.8	446.8	0.7	L	06-09	838.0	838.9	0.3	E	06-09	1119.8	1124.2	1.5	S
	SD	06-09	13.9	14.1			06-09	15.0	14.9			06-09	16.1	18.4		
Latino	MSS	06-09	446.8	448.0	0.4	S	06-09	840.9	842.1	0.4	L	06-09	1126.2	1130.0	1.3	S
	SD	06-09	12.8	13.6			06-09	14.7	14.3			06-09	17.5	18.8		
Asian	MSS	06-09	452.3	455.0	0.9	L	06-09	850.1	851.3	0.4	L	06-09	1136.3	1142.3	2.0	S
	SD	06-09	14.4	14.9			06-09	15.0	15.7			06-09	20.3	21.2		
Native American	MSS	06-09	448.1	449.7	0.5	S	06-09	840.2	841.8	0.5	L	06-09	1126.7	1131.6	1.6	S
	SD	06-09	12.5	11.8			06-09	15.0	14.4			06-09	17.0	19.0		
Not low-income	MSS	06-09	458.3	460.3	0.7		06-09	854.5	855.1	0.2		06-09	1142.4	1148.4	2.0	
	SD	06-09	12.2	12.4			06-09	13.5	13.9			06-09	18.7	18.9		
Low-income	MSS	06-09	448.5	450.0	0.5	S	06-09	842.7	843.6	0.3	L	06-09	1127.7	1132.2	1.5	S
	SD	06-09	13.3	13.4			06-09	14.9	14.7			06-09	17.9	19.6		
Not disabled	MSS	06-09	456.5	458.3	0.6		06-09	853.0	853.7	0.2		06-09	1141.0	1146.8	1.9	
	SD	06-09	12.6	12.7			06-09	13.5	13.7			06-09	18.8	19.0		
Students with disabilities ³	MSS	06-09	446.6	447.1	0.2	S	06-09	834.7	836.0	0.4	L	06-09	1119.6	1121.7	0.7	S
	SD	06-09	14.9	15.1			06-09	15.3	15.3			06-09	15.6	17.8		
Not ELLs	MSS	07-09	456.8	457.8	0.5		07-09	851.3	852.4	0.6		07-09	1140.5	1145.3	2.4	
	SD	07-09	14.2	13.1			07-09	15.6	14.7			07-09	20.0	19.9		
English language learners ³	MSS	07-09	443.6	445.6	1.0	L	07-09	838.7	838.5	-0.1	S	07-09	1120.2	1125.3	2.6	L
	SD	07-09	14.4	13.7			07-09	15.0	14.2			07-09	15.6	18.7		
Female	MSS	06-09	455.3	457.0	0.6		06-09	851.3	851.6	0.1		06-09	1138.4	1143.4	1.7	
	SD	06-09	13.6	13.6			06-09	14.7	14.9			06-09	18.6	19.7		
Male	MSS	06-09	454.8	456.3	0.5	S	06-09	850.4	851.4	0.3	L	06-09	1139.4	1144.9	1.8	L
	SD	06-09	13.2	13.6			06-09	15.2	15.3			06-09	20.5	21.0		

Table reads: In 2006, the mean scale score on the state 4th grade math test was 457.2 for white students and 444.8 for African American students. In 2009, the mean scale score in 4th grade math was 459.1 for white students and 446.8 for African American students. Between 2006 and 2009, the mean scale score

improved at an average yearly rate of 0.6 points for white students and 0.7 points for African American students, indicating a narrowing of the achievement gap for African Americans.

Note: The Minnesota Comprehensive Assessments—Series II (MCA-II) is scored on a scale of x01 – x99; x indicates the grade level.

¹Numbers in these columns are subject to rounding error.

²The number of students tested in this subgroup at this grade level was fewer than 500 in 2009 or the most recent year with available data, so changes for this subgroup should be interpreted with caution.

³Gap trends for students with disabilities and English language learners should be interpreted with caution because state and federal policy changes may have affected the year-to-year comparability of test results for these subgroups.

Table MN-15. Numbers of test-takers

Subgroup	Subject	Grade 4					Grade 8					Grade 10 Reading/ Grade 11 Math				
		Year span	# of test-takers start year	# of test-takers end year	Change in # of test-takers over time	% of test-takers in subgroup in end year	Year span	# of test-takers start year	# of test-takers end year	Change in # of test-takers over time	% of test-takers in subgroup in end year	Year span	# of test-takers start year	# of test-takers end year	Change in # of test-takers over time	% of test-takers in subgroup in end year
All tested students	Reading	06-09	53,935	58,504	8.5%	100.0%	06-09	61,499	60,412	-1.8%	100.0%	06-09	64,682	64,448	-0.4%	100.0%
	Math	06-09	57,299	58,664	2.4%	100.0%	06-09	63,498	60,532	-4.7%	100.0%	06-09	62,642	63,340	1.1%	100.0%
White	Reading	06-09	43,892	43,771	-0.3%	74.8%	06-09	50,458	46,923	-7.0%	77.7%	06-09	54,139	50,768	-6.2%	78.8%
	Math	06-09	44,237	43,815	-1.0%	74.7%	06-09	50,564	46,954	-7.1%	77.6%	06-09	52,070	50,653	-2.7%	80.0%
African American	Reading	06-09	4,346	5,660	30.2%	9.7%	06-09	4,725	5,272	11.6%	8.7%	06-09	4,232	5,432	28.4%	8.4%
	Math	06-09	4,952	5,714	15.4%	9.7%	06-09	5,150	5,300	2.9%	8.8%	06-09	4,121	5,134	24.6%	8.1%
Latino	Reading	06-09	2,072	4,152	100.4%	7.1%	06-09	2,097	3,314	58.0%	5.5%	06-09	1,979	3,067	55.0%	4.8%
	Math	06-09	3,413	4,184	22.6%	7.1%	06-09	2,876	3,349	16.4%	5.5%	06-09	1,977	2,625	32.8%	4.1%
Asian	Reading	06-09	2,448	3,626	48.1%	6.2%	06-09	2,830	3,541	25.1%	5.9%	06-09	3,048	3,759	23.3%	5.8%
	Math	06-09	3,474	3,656	5.2%	6.2%	06-09	3,514	3,568	1.5%	5.9%	06-09	3,318	3,654	10.1%	5.8%
Native American	Reading	06-09	1,113	1,237	11.1%	2.1%	06-09	1,318	1,226	-7.0%	2.0%	06-09	1,157	1,212	4.8%	1.9%
	Math	06-09	1,159	1,235	6.6%	2.1%	06-09	1,324	1,222	-7.7%	2.0%	06-09	1,040	1,039	-0.1%	1.6%
Low-income	Reading	06-09	16,439	20,320	23.6%	34.7%	06-09	17,838	18,448	3.4%	30.5%	06-09	16,181	18,080	11.7%	28.1%
	Math	06-09	19,254	20,441	6.2%	34.8%	06-09	19,591	18,538	-5.4%	30.6%	06-09	14,831	16,131	8.8%	25.5%
Students w/ disabilities	Reading	06-09	7,807	8,283	6.1%	14.2%	06-09	7,453	7,266	-2.5%	12.0%	06-09	7,084	7,130	0.6%	11.1%
	Math	06-09	8,323	8,350	0.3%	14.2%	06-09	7,580	7,297	-3.7%	12.1%	06-09	6,291	6,423	2.1%	10.1%
English language learners	Reading	07-09	5,162	5,246	1.6%	9.0%	07-09	3,875	3,448	-11.0%	5.7%	07-09	3,796	3,638	-4.2%	5.6%
	Math	07-09	4,986	5,361	7.5%	9.1%	07-09	3,846	3,561	-7.4%	5.9%	07-09	2,799	3,176	13.5%	5.0%
Female	Reading	06-09	26,495	28,619	8.0%	48.9%	06-09	30,017	29,451	-1.9%	48.8%	06-09	31,761	31,403	-1.1%	48.7%
	Math	06-09	28,047	28,678	2.2%	48.9%	06-09	30,976	29,493	-4.8%	48.7%	06-09	30,969	31,107	0.4%	49.1%
Male	Reading	06-09	27,437	29,883	8.9%	51.1%	06-09	31,480	30,960	-1.7%	51.2%	06-09	32,914	33,043	0.4%	51.3%
	Math	06-09	29,248	29,985	2.5%	51.1%	06-09	32,520	31,038	-4.6%	51.3%	06-09	31,671	32,233	1.8%	50.9%

Table reads: In 2006, 43,892 students in the white subgroup took the state 4th grade reading test. By 2009, the number of white test-takers had fallen to 43,771 students, a decrease of 0.3%. In 2009, the white subgroup made up 74.8% of the 58,504 4th graders taking the reading test that year.

Note: **Bold** type indicates that the number of students tested in this subgroup at this grade level was fewer than 500 in 2009 or the most recent year with available data.

Key Terms

Percentage proficient (and above) — The percentage of students in a group who score at or above the cut score for “proficient” performance on the state test used to determine progress under NCLB. The Act requires states to report student test performance in terms of at least three achievement levels: basic, proficient, and advanced. Adequate yearly progress determinations are based on the percentage of students scoring at the proficient level and above.

Percentage basic (and above) — The percentage of students in a group who score at or above the cut score for “basic” performance on the state test used to determine progress under NCLB.

Percentage advanced — The percentage of students in a group who reach or exceed the cut score for “advanced” performance on the state test used to determine progress under NCLB.

Moderate-to-large gain — For the percentage basic, proficient, or advanced, an average gain of 1 or more percentage points per year. For effect size, an average gain of 0.02 or greater per year.

Slight gain — For the percentage basic, proficient, or advanced, an average gain of less than 1 percentage point per year. For effect size, an average gain of less than 0.02 per year.

Moderate-to-large decline — For the percentage basic, proficient, or advanced, an average decline of 1 or more percentage points per year. For effect size, an average decline of 0.02 or greater per year.

Slight decline — For the percentage basic, proficient, or advanced, an average decline of less than 1 percentage point per year. For effect size, an average decline of less than 0.02 per year.

Effect size — A statistical tool that conveys the amount of difference between test results using a common unit of measurement which does not depend on the scoring scale for a particular test.

Accumulated annual effect size — The cumulative gain in effect size over a range of years.

Mean scale score — The arithmetical average of a group of test scores, expressed on a common scale for a particular state's test. The mean is calculated by adding the scores and dividing the sum by the number of scores.

Standard deviation — A measure of how much test scores tend to deviate from the mean—in other words, how spread out or bunched together test scores are. If students' scores are bunched together, with many scores close to the mean, then the standard deviation will be small. If scores are spread out, with many students scoring at the high or low end of the scale, then the standard deviation will be large.

Cautions and Explanations

Different labels for achievement levels — For consistency, all of the state profiles developed for this report use a common set of labels (basic, proficient, and advanced) for the main achievement levels required by NCLB. In practice, however, some states may use different labels, such as “meets standard” instead of proficient, and some states have established additional achievement levels beyond those required by NCLB.

Different names for subgroups — For the sake of consistency and ease of data tabulation, all of the state profiles developed for this report use a common set of names for the major student subgroups. In practice, however, states use various names for subgroups that may differ from those used here (such as using “Hispanic” instead of “Latino,” or “special education students” instead of “students with disabilities”). Moreover, a few states separately track the performance of subgroups not included in the analyses for this report.

Special caution for students with disabilities and English language learners — Trends for students with disabilities and English language learners should be interpreted with caution because changes in federal guidance and state accountability plans may have altered which students in these subgroups are tested for accountability purposes, how they are tested, and when their test scores are counted as proficient under NCLB. These factors could affect the year-to-year comparability of test results.

Inclusion of former English language learners — In many states, the subgroup of English language learners (also known as limited English proficient students) includes students who were formerly English language learners but who have achieved English language proficiency or fluency in the last two years. Federal NCLB regulations permit states to include these formerly ELL students (sometimes referred to as “redesignated fluent English proficient” students) in the ELL subgroup for up to two years for purposes of NCLB accountability.

Limitations of percentage proficient measure — The percentage proficient, the main gauge of student performance under NCLB, can be easily understood and gives a snapshot of how many students have met their state’s performance expectations. But it also has several limitations as a measure of student achievement. Users of percentage proficient data should keep in mind these limitations, particularly the following:

- * “Proficient” means different things across different states. States vary widely in curriculum, learning expectations, and tests, and state tests differ considerably in their difficulty and cut scores for proficient performance.
- * Although this study has taken steps to avoid comparing test data where there have been “breaks” in comparability resulting from new tests, changes in content standards, revised cut scores, or other major changes in testing programs, the year-to-year comparability of test results in the same state may still be affected by less obvious policy and demographic changes.
- * Changes in student performance may occur that are not reflected in percentage proficient data, such as an increase in the number of students reaching performance levels below and above proficient (such as the basic or advanced levels).
- * The size of the achievement gaps between various subgroups depends in part on where a state sets its cut score for proficiency. For example, if a proficiency cut score is set so high that almost nobody reaches it or so low that almost everyone reaches it, there will be little apparent achievement gap. By contrast, if the cut score is closer to the mean test score, the gaps between subgroups will be more apparent.

Difficulty of attributing causes — Although the tables in this profile show trends in test scores since the enactment of NCLB, one cannot assume that these trends have occurred *because* of NCLB. It is always difficult to determine a cause-and-effect relationship between test score trends and any specific education policy or program due to the many federal, state, and local reforms undertaken in recent years and due to the lack of an appropriate “control” group of students not affected by NCLB.